

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
SEP 25 2006

IN THE DRAWINGS

The drawings are amended to correct informalities. Particularly, a Replacement Sheet of Figure 5 is submitted herewith so as to be designated as prior art. No new matter is added.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 25 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed on March 23, 2006. The revisions to claim 1 are supported, for example, by Figures 1 and 2. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7 remain pending.

Drawing Objections:

The drawings were objected to for not disclosing every feature specified in the claims. Namely, the drawings do not show the feature of "an adhesive layer with a uniform refractive index" found in claim 1. Claim 1 as amended does not include this feature. Withdrawal of this objection is requested. Applicants do not concede the correctness of this objection.

§103(a) Rejections:

Claims 1-7 were rejected as being obvious over EP 0 933 663 (EP '663). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a composite display unit that requires, among other features, a first and second display element, a liquid crystal panel and a reflective polarization plate. The composite display unit is arranged such that the reflective polarization plate is directly joined to a first transparent substrate of the liquid crystal panel and a second transparent substrate of the same panel is directly joined to the second display element. As a result, first and second display elements are joined to each other with no object intervening. The advantage of this arrangement is that the reflective polarization plate does not come between the first display element and the second display element. Thus, the light passing through first and second display elements is not weakened by having to travel through the reflective polarization plate. This arrangement also provides the advantage of a composite display unit that is relatively compact.

The EP '663 does not teach or suggest these features. This reference teaches a reflective polarization plate (22) disposed between a first display element (100) and a second display element (200) (See Fig. 5). This arrangement weakens the light passing through the first and second display elements and also hinders the overall size reduction of the display. Nowhere does this reference teach or suggest improving the intensity of

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 25 2006

light passing through first and second display elements or of decreasing the size of the composite display unit by changing the location of the reflective polarization element. For at least these reasons claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

Conclusion:

Applicant respectfully asserts claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, Douglas P. Mueller (Reg. No. 30,300), at (612) 455-3804.



Dated: September 25, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: 

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No. 30,300
DPM/ahk